

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 6 2024

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JANETTE HARRISON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 23-3210

D.C. No. 2:22-cv-01811-RAJ

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Washington  
Richard A. Jones, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 29, 2024\*\*

Before: FRIEDLAND, BENNETT, and SANCHEZ, Circuit Judges.

Janette Harrison appeals pro se from the district court's order denying her motion for appointment of counsel in her employment discrimination action. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. *Bradshaw v. Zoological Soc'y of San Diego*, 662 F.2d 1301, 1305 (9th Cir. 1981) (order denying appointment of counsel

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

in a Title VII action is appealable under the collateral order doctrine). We review de novo questions of our own jurisdiction, *Hunt v. Imperial Merch. Servs., Inc.*, 560 F.3d 1137, 1140 (9th Cir. 2009), and we dismiss this appeal as moot.

Harrison's appeal is moot because, during the pendency of this appeal, Harrison voluntarily dismissed the action that formed the basis of the appeal. *See Akina v. Hawaii*, 835 F.3d 1003, 1010 (9th Cir. 2016) (an interlocutory appeal is moot when the court can no longer grant any effective relief); *ACF Indus. Inc. v. Cal. State Bd. of Equalization*, 42 F.3d 1286, 1292 (9th Cir. 1994) (dismissing as moot certain claims on appeal because the claims were dismissed before the district court while the appeal was pending).

In light of our disposition, we do not consider Harrison's contentions regarding the merits of the appeal.

**DISMISSED.**